

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/834,109		SEGAL ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Stephanie Zitomer		1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Stephanie Zitomer. (3) Matt Bodet for applicant.
 (2) Kathleen Williams for applicant. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 May 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-22.

Identification of prior art discussed: (Gold et al.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Exmr. agreed to withdraw rejection of claims 1-6 under 112, first paragraph. Applicant agreed amend claims 17-22 with limitation to cells in culture to overcome this rejection. Applicant suggested adding functional limitation of Watson-Crick base pairing to "biological effector sequence" to overcome art rejections. Examiner will consider.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required